



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 09/870,716 | 05/30/2001 | Hiroshi Urabe | 71369-55968 | 8909 |

7590 07/19/2002

Dike, Bronstein, Roberts & Cushman
Intellectual Property Practice Group
Edwards & Angell
P.O. Box 9169
Boston, MA 02209

EXAMINER

RAJGURU, UMAKANT K

| ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
|----------|--------------|
|----------|--------------|

1711

DATE MAILED: 07/19/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

T-P

Office Action Summary

| | | | |
|-----------------|--|----------------|--|
| Application No. | | Applicant(s) | |
| Examiner | | Group Art Unit | |

—The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet beneath the correspondence address—

Period for Response

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR RESPONSE IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a response be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for response specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a response within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for response is specified above, such period shall, by default, expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to respond within the set or extended period for response will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).

Status

- ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _____.
- ☐ This action is **FINAL**.
- ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, **prosecution as to the merits is closed** in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- ☒ Claim(s) 1-13 is/are pending in the application.
- Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- ☒ Claim(s) 1-13 is/are rejected.
- ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction or election requirement.

Application Papers

- ☐ See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948.
- ☐ The proposed drawing correction, filed on _____ is ☐ approved ☐ disapproved.
- ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are objected to by the Examiner.
- ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 (a)-(d)

- ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).
- ☒ All ☐ Some* ☐ None of the CERTIFIED copies of the priority documents have been received.
- ☐ received in Application No. (Series Code/Serial Number) _____.
- ☐ received in this national stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 1.7.2(a)).

*Certified copies not received: _____

Attachment(s)

- ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper No(s) 4 & 5
- ☒ Notice of References Cited, PTO-892
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948
- ☐ Interview Summary, PTO-413
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-152
- ☐ Other _____

Office Action Summary

Art Unit: 1711

1. Claims 1-13 are being examined.
2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claim 1-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nakacho et al (EP 0945478) in view of Ida et al (USP 6337031) or An et al (USP 5028347).

Nakacho discloses a flame retardant, which is phosphazene compound, a resin composition and a molded article (abstract). Various thermoplastic resins are used, some of them being a polyamide, modified polyphenylene ether, styrene resin and modified styrene resins (page 10, lines 7-18). Phosphazene compound is described on page 3, line 12 to page 6, line 32 and it reads on the one that is instantly claimed. Composition comprises (a) 100 parts by wt of resin, (b) 0.1 to 100 parts by wt of a flame

Art Unit: 1711

retardant, (c) 0.1 to 50 parts by wt of organic phosphorus compound (page 4, lines 6-13). Claimed cyclic phenoxy phosphazene is disclosed on page 33, lines 25-38. Inorganic fillers are describe on page 10, line 39 to page 11, line 18. Glass fibers are one of them (page 10, line 51).

Nakacho does not mention a magnetic powder (of instant claims 10-12).

Ida discloses a flame-retardant resin magnet material comprising a magnetic powder based on ferrite (col. 2, line 65 to col. 3; line 31).

An also describes a flame-retardant magnetic composite resin composition comprising a magnetic powder (col. 9, line 42 to col.10, line 4).

It would therefore have been obvious to add to the composition of Nakacho, the magnetic powder (of Ida or An) with the expectation of obtaining a molded article such as a magnet, having flame retardant property as well as magnetic property.

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

4. Claims 1-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Nakacho et al (EP 0945478).


Disclosure of Nakacho, presented earlier shows that above claims lack novelty.


5. Any inquiry concerning this communication from the examiner should be directed to U.K. Rajguru whose telephone number is 703-308-3224. The examiner can generally be reached on Monday-Friday 9:30 am-6:00 pm.

Art Unit: 1711

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, James Seidleck can be reached on 703-308-2462. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application is assigned are 703-872-9310 for regular communications and 703-872-9311 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-0661.


U.K. Rajguru/dh
July 17, 2002


James J. Seidleck
Supervisory Patent Examiner
Technology Center 1700